



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,744	07/03/2003	Roderick MacKinnon	600-I-220CIP1DIV	5620
23565	7590	06/29/2006	EXAMINER	
KLAUBER & JACKSON 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			STANDLEY, STEVEN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1649

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 11-15, 17-22 (in part), 30, 55-57, and 67-68, drawn to channel polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - II. Claims 16, 23-29, 37-44, drawn to nucleic acids encoding channel polypeptides and a method of making the polypeptide, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
 - III. Claims 31-36, drawn to antibodies directed to a channel polypeptide, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Groups I-III are directed to products that are distinct both physically and functionally, are not required one for the other, and are therefore patentably distinct. Further, the protein of Group I can be prepared by processes which are materially different from recombinant DNA expression of Group II, such as by chemical synthesis, or by isolation and purification from natural sources. Additionally, the DNA of Group II can be used other than to make the protein of Group I, such in gene therapy or as a probe in nucleic acid hybridization assays. The

Art Unit: 1649

protein of Group I can be used in materially different methods other than to make the antibody of Group III, such as in therapeutic or diagnostic methods (e.g., in screening). Finally, although the antibody of Group III can be used to obtain the protein of Group I, it can also be used in materially different methods, such as in various diagnostic (e.g., as a probe in immunoassays or immunochromatography), or therapeutic methods. Therefore a search and examination of the methods of groups I-III would constitute an undue burden, since the searches are entirely different and not coextensive, the classifications are different and the subject matter divergent.

Furthermore, within group I, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 USC 121:

The inventions are directed to a prokaryotic cation channel mutated to mimic a eukaryotic channel. The claims encompass several types of structurally divergent and functionally distinct prokaryotic, eukaryotic, and mutated prokaryotic channels. For instance, the cation channel can be a potassium, sodium, or calcium channel. Moreover, all the channels recited have a patentably distinct SEQ ID NO. Therefore, because the channels recited are structurally, functionally and patentably distinct, a search and examination of any of the prokaryotic channels mutated to mimic a eukaryotic channel would represent a burden on the examiner. Applicant must further elect I) a prokaryotic channel SEQ ID NO, and II) the corresponding eukaryotic SEQ ID NO from among the following polypeptides: SEQ ID NO: 1-14, wherein SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3 and 7 are prokaryotic cation channels, and SEQ ID NOs: 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, or 14 are eukaryotic channels.

Applicant is advised that this is not a requirement to elect a species. Rather, this is a second restriction requirement superimposed upon the requirement to elect from groups I-III. In order to be fully responsive, Applicant must elect one group from I-III and should Applicant elect group I, one combination of prokaryotic and eukaryotic channels from within the elected group from those listed above and recited in claims of groups I.

In re Ochiai

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1649


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Standley whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3432**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on **(571) 272-0867**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

Steve Standley, Ph.D.
6/14/06


DAVID S. ROMEO
PRIMARY EXAMINER